

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

JIMMY LEE PARSONS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:09CV166
(Judge Keeley)

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, COMMISSIONER
OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
OPINION/REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B), Rule 72(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Court Rule 4.01(d), on December 15, 2009, the Court referred this Social Security action to United States Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert with directions to submit proposed findings of fact and a recommendation for disposition.

On May 18, 2010, Magistrate Judge Seibert filed his Report and Recommendation ("R&R"), and directed the parties, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and Rule 6(e), Fed. R. Civ. P., to file with the Clerk of Court any written objections within ten (10) days after being served with a copy of the R&R. He further advised the parties that failure to file objections would result in a waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of this Court. The parties did not file any objections.

**ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Upon consideration of Magistrate Judge Seibert's recommendation and having received no written objections,¹ the Court accepts the R&R in whole and **ORDERS** this civil action disposed of in accordance with the recommendation of the Magistrate. Accordingly,

1. the Commissioner's motion for Summary Judgment (dkt. no. 12) is **GRANTED**;
2. the plaintiff's motion for Summary Judgment (dkt. no. 11) is **DENIED**; and
3. this civil action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** and **RETIRED** from the docket of this Court.

Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 58, the Court directs the Clerk of Court to enter a separate judgment order and to transmit copies of both Orders to counsel of record.

DATED: July 7, 2010.

/s/ Irene M. Keeley

IRENE M. KEELEY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The failure of the parties to object to the Report and Recommendation not only waives their appellate rights in this matter, but also relieves the Court of any obligation to conduct a *de novo* review of the issues presented. See Wells v. Shriners Hospital, 109 F.3d 198, 199-200 (4th Cir. 1997); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140,148-153 (1985).